

# **Indiana Department of Education Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission**

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and  
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**






**U. S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202**

## ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

**Performance Indicator 2.1:** The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

### A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

-  Address grades K through 12
-  Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
-  Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)

### STATE RESPONSE

#### Overview:

The development of Indiana's K-12 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards began in November 2002, and through extensive collaboration with a variety of resources, the ELP Standards are now in a final DRAFT form awaiting Indiana State Board of Education review. The Indiana ELP Standards address the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient (LEP) students at each grade level K through 12, address the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and are linked to the academic content achievement standards in English/LA and mathematics.

#### How the ELP Standards address grades K-12:

Since Indiana's academic standards are written by individual grade level, our ELP Standards have been developed individually for grades K through 12. Within each standard, indicators are provided for each proficiency level 1-5. Each standard and its corresponding indicators at each proficiency level are linked to grade appropriate Indiana Academic Standards.

The grade specific ELP Standards will serve as a classroom tool for informing instruction and assisting teachers in evaluating LEP students' progress in their acquisition of English proficiency. Also, this grade-level format is more accessible to parents who can follow grade specific ELP Standards to support the progress of their children.

#### How the ELP Standards address the four domains:

Within each standard, indicators are provided for each English proficiency level 1-5. The indicators at each proficiency level address the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In incorporating these domains into the ELP Standards, it has been essential to consider the process of second language acquisition and the development of Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cummings, Jim (1981). "The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students." Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework, p. 3-50.

The BICS component of language acquisition relates more strongly to the domains of listening (comprehension) and speaking, whereas the CALP component incorporates all domains and facilitates academic performance at grade level in the content area classroom.

Each ELP Standard illustrates the need for students to use their new English skills for social and academic purposes starting at the “Beginner” level (Level 1) and continuing to the “Fluent English Proficient” level (Level 5).<sup>2</sup> The ELP Standards address the four domains and incorporate both the BICS and CALP dimensions of second language acquisition. At each proficiency level, there are specific performance indicators that can be elicited from and expected of students in order to demonstrate competence of the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.<sup>3</sup>

### **How the ELP Standards are linked to academic content and achievement standards in Eng/LA, Math, and Science:**

The Indiana Academic Standards define what all Indiana students, including students for whom English is a second language, are expected to know and be able to do in the academic content areas. The English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards are designed to guide limited English proficient (LEP) students through the process of English acquisition in a manner that is linked to the Indiana Academic Standards. This linking ensures that LEP students develop proficiency in the English language while simultaneously developing the academic concepts and skills contained in the Indiana Academic Standards. The ELP Standards provide all teachers with information they can use to ensure that English language development is occurring appropriately for all students, including LEP students who enter Indiana schools.

The ELP Standards address skills that LEP students must acquire in English language learning to enable them to become proficient in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension in English, in addition to proficiency on the Indiana Academic Standards at each grade level.

The ELP Standards delineate the proficiency levels students move through in the process of English language development. They also facilitate the alignment of curriculum between ESL services and the general education program. They serve as a tool to classroom teachers of all LEP students, regardless of their instructional program, and allow them to access the mainstream curriculum in order to increase the potential for LEP students to participate in the general education program.

The ELP Standards provide a foundation for LEP students by identifying grade appropriate performance indicators linked to the Indiana Academic Standards for English/LA and Mathematics. Because the indicators within the ELP Standards integrate skills used in the Indiana Academic Standards, LEP students are exposed to the Indiana Academic Standards as they progress through the proficiency levels 1 through 5. By 2005-06, Indiana will link the ELP Standards to the Indiana Academic Standards for Science through the same process that has occurred for English/LA and Math.

---

<sup>2</sup> Morita-Mullaney, Patricia “Indiana’s English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards” Draft – Introduction, p. 5 July 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Morita-Mullaney, Patricia “Indiana’s English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards” Draft – Introduction, p. 9 July 2003.

**B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1**

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

<b>Baseline Data for 2002-2003</b>					
ELP Assessment(s)	Total number of LEP Identified	Number and Percentage at Basic or <b>Level 1</b>	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or <b>Level 2</b>	Number and Percentage at Advanced or <b>Level 3</b>	Number and Percentage at <b>Level 4</b>
Woodcock-Muñoz	12,973	1,593 6.3%	1,963 7.8%	4,350 17.3%	5,067 20%
LAS	7,566	2,133 8.5%	1,298 5.2%	1,792 7.2%	2,343 9.4%
IPT	2,101	185 0.7%	306 1.2%	410 1.6%	1,200 4.8%
Other	2,479	309 1.2%	586 2.4%	414 1.7%	1,170 4.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25,119</b>	<b>4,220 16.8%</b>	<b>4,153 16.5%</b>	<b>6,966 27.8%</b>	<b>9,780 38.9%</b>

In addition to the 25,119 students identified as LEP for school year 2002-03, an additional 21,440 students were identified as fluent English proficient FEP (Level 5). A total number of 46,559 students were identified as language minority for school year 2002-03.

The following definitions reflect the levels of English proficiency accepted for use in Indiana for the 2002-03 school year and do not reflect updated definitions included in the ELP Standards Draft document. The updated definitions are linked to the upcoming English Proficiency Assessment Test being developed by the LEP State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) through the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Once this assessment becomes available, it is our intent to employ it as Indiana's sole measure of English proficiency.

**State Definitions of Levels of English Proficiency:**

Beginner (Level 1)	The student does not speak, understand, read or write English but may know a few isolated words or expressions.
Early Intermediate (Level 2)	The student understands simple sentences in English, especially when spoken slowly, but does not speak, understand, read or write English, except for isolated words or expressions.
Intermediate (Level 3)	The student communicates in English with hesitancy and difficulty. With effort and help, the student can carry on a conversation in English, read and understand at least parts of lessons, and follow simple directions.
Advanced (Level 4)	The student speaks and understands English without difficulty, reads and writes two (2) or more years below grade level.
Fluent English Proficient (Level 5)	The student speaks, understands, reads, writes, and comprehends in English without difficulty and displays academic achievement comparable to native English speaking peers.

**Composite Score:**

- ?? Describe how the composite score was derived
- ?? Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
- ?? Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score

**STATE RESPONSE:****How composite score was derived:**

The State approved instruments to assess English proficiency for the 2002-03 school year were the Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey (Riverside Publishing), the Language Assessment Scales (CTB/McGraw Hill), and the IDEA Proficiency Tests (Ballard & Tighe Publishers). These tests provide slightly different levels of proficiency for listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehending the English language. Thus, it is necessary to convert the scores of the tests to a standardized level of proficiency (see the State Definitions of levels of English proficiency on the previous page). The composite score for each proficiency level was derived by reviewing the test publishers' guides and manuals, reviewing conversion formulas from other States, and identifying student ability levels in each domain. The purpose of this composite level is to assist schools in converting their students' cut scores from the State approved instruments into standardized language proficiency levels that will equivalently show the number of students scoring at each of the levels when reported to the Indiana Department of Education.

Through our participation in the LEP SCASS consortia and ultimately with the availability of a single instrument to English proficiency, our method of deriving the composite score will change. With this new instrument, a more comprehensive assessment of all domains will be possible.

The following chart shows schools how the scores from the Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey, the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), and the IDEA Proficiency Tests (IPT) can be aligned to Indiana's Levels of English Language Proficiency. All domains of the tests must be administered in order to derive a composite score that aligns to Indiana's defined levels of English proficiency.

**Composite Scores for the Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey,  
Language Assessment Scales (LAS), and IDEA Proficiency Tests (IPT)**

<b>Indiana English Language Proficiency Level</b>	<b>Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Language Assessment Scales (LAS)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>IDEA Proficiency Tests (IPT)<sup>6</sup></b>
<b>1 Beginner</b>	1	1/1, 1/2, 1/3	3-5
<b>2 Early Intermediate</b>	1.5-2	1/4, 1/5	6-8
<b>3 Intermediate</b>	2.5-3	2/2, 2/3, 2/4, 2/5	9-11
<b>4 Advanced</b>	3.5-4	3/2, 3/3	12-14
<b>5 Fluent English Proficient</b>	4.5-5	3/4, 3/5	15

**How five domains of English proficiency were incorporated:**

Students must demonstrate abilities in all five language domains while learning English (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension). These abilities are demonstrated at various levels of English proficiency. The incorporation of the five domains into the composite score varies among proficiency levels as well as individual assessment instruments.

Beginner (Level 1) - exhibits abilities in the domains of listening, comprehension (60%), and speaking (40%), while there is little to no display of reading comprehension and writing abilities.

Early Intermediate (Level 2) - incorporates the domains of listening, comprehension (50%), and speaking (40%) more heavily, with low-level demonstration of the domains of reading comprehension and writing (10%).

<sup>4</sup> Richard W. Woodcock and Ana F. Muñoz-Sandoval, Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey Comprehensive Manual, (Chicago: Riverside Publishing, 1993) 38.

<sup>5</sup> Indiana Department of Education, Division of Language Minority and Migrant Programs and Indiana ESL Taskforce. Indiana's English Language Proficiency Standards: Kindergarten Through Grade 12. Indiana: June 2003.

<sup>6</sup> New Jersey Department of Education. Title III English Language Proficiency Tests Conversion. 19 August 2003 <http://www.state.nj.us/njded/bilingual/resources/title3/title3tests.pdf>.

Intermediate (Level 3) - demonstrates an improvement in listening, comprehension, and speaking (65%), with added emphasis on beginning reading comprehension and writing skills (35%).

Early Advanced (Level 4) - shows continued improvement in the domains of listening, comprehension, and speaking (55%), and increased development of reading comprehension and writing skills (45%).

Fluent English Proficient (Level 5) - shows evidence of grade-level academic performance comparable to native English speaking peers and equally improved development of all domains (100%).

**How the domains were weighted to develop the composite score:**

Indiana English Language Proficiency Level	Language Domain			
	Listening/ Comprehensio n	Speaking	Reading/ Comprehensi on	Writing
1 Beginner	60%	40%	---	
2 Early Intermediate	50%	40%	10%	
3 Intermediate	65%		35%	
4 Advanced	55%		45%	
5 Fluent English Proficient	100%			

**Please provide the following additional information:**

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

**STATE RESPONSE:**

The instruments used included: Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey, Language Assessment Scales (LAS), and Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). Each instrument assesses the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension. These instruments were used for all grade levels K-12.

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

**STATE RESPONSE:**

The total number of students assessed for English proficiency for the school year 2002-03 was 46,559 students.



3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

**STATE RESPONSE:**

Of the total 46,559 students assessed, 25,119 were LEP and 21,440 were FEP.

### C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

**Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:**

-  **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments**
-  **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.**




#### STATE RESPONSE

A student who speaks, understands, reads, writes, and comprehends in English without difficulty and displays academic achievement comparable to native English speaking peers is considered English proficient. Students scoring at the proficient level (Level 5) on Indiana's test(s) of English proficiency for two consecutive years are defined as "proficient" in English. Currently, the three state-approved English proficiency assessment instruments equate to a Level 5 when students obtain the following score/range of scores:

Woodcock-Muñoz	4.5 - 5
Language Assessment Scales (LAS)	3/4, 3/5
Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	15

All five domains are included in each test instrument currently used in Indiana. However, once the LEP SCASS consortia's English proficiency assessment instrument is available, Indiana intends to implement it statewide as its uniform measure of English acquisition and proficiency.

**Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:**

-  **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
-  **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
-  **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

#### STATE RESPONSE

A description of the English proficiency levels is included in Part B - Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1. Making progress in English language proficiency may occur within a level of English proficiency as well as from one level to another. In either case, making progress in English proficiency is determined by multiple sources including improvement in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension as measured by student performance on an English language proficiency assessment, class assignments, teacher observations, and overall academic achievement.

The criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next is outlined in Part B in reference to the questions:

- How five domains of English proficiency were incorporated into the composite score?
- How the domains were weighted into the composite score?

The domains in which a student must progress in order to move from one level to another include:

- From Level 1 to Level 2 - improvement in listening (comprehension), and speaking
- From Level 2 to Level 3 - improvement in listening (comprehension), speaking, and reading
- From Level 3 to Level 4 - improvement in listening (comprehension), speaking, and reading (comprehension), and writing
- From Level 4 to Level 5 - grade level academic performance comparable to native English speaking peers and improvement in listening (comprehension), speaking, and reading (comprehension), and writing

**Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.**

### STATE RESPONSE

The cohort has been defined as the K-12 group of LEP students enrolled during school year 2002-03. The LEP students' progression of English acquisition has been charted over a seven year continuum to identify the % or # of students making progress and attaining proficiency. Factors influencing these percentages include: average length of time for students to move from one level to the next; level of prior formal schooling; proficiency level upon entry; and age/grade; and data on transitioned students (length of time in program, proficiency level upon entry, etc).

### English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

**\*Unit of Analysis/Cohort:** Base Year 2002-2003, K-12 Cohort, Group 1

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	39%	4.6%
2004-2005 School Year	58.8%	21.7%
2005-2006 School Year	71.4%	30.7%
2006-2007 School Year	74.3%	60.6%
2007-2008 School Year	77.3%	77.3%
2008-2009 School Year	89.9%	90%
2009-2010 School Year	100%	100%

**Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1:** The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

**A.** In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	96.2	95
2003-2004 Target	97.4	96.6
2004-2005 Target	98.7	98.2
2005-2006 Target	100	100

**B.** To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State’s definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

#### Indiana Definition of a Highly Qualified Teacher per ESEA

Each state education agency (SEA) must develop a plan to ensure that all teachers are “highly qualified” no later than the end of the 2005-06 school year. The plan must establish annual, measurable objectives for each local school district and school to ensure that they meet the “highly qualified” requirement. In general, a “highly qualified teacher” is a teacher with full certification, a bachelor’s degree, and demonstrated competence in subject knowledge and teaching skills. See Section 9101(23) of the ESEA for the complete definition of a highly qualified teacher.

#### Charter School Teachers

In Indiana, teachers in public charter schools are required to meet the same certification requirements as teachers in other public schools, as described below.

#### Teachers with Bulletin 400 Licenses

Individuals with an instructional license issued prior September 1, 1985 were required to obtain a Master’s degree prior to December 31, 1990. These individuals have full state certification as defined in Sec 200.55(a) and the Master’s degree meets the definition of Sec 200.56 (b)(3)(B), as highly qualified teacher.

#### Teachers with Rules 46-47 Licenses

Individuals with licenses issued after July 1, 1986 are required to pass state licensing tests as described in Sec 200.56(b)(2) prior to the issuance of their first standard license. These individuals are required to engage in professional development consistent with the principles outlined in ESEA section 9101(34) in order to renew the license every five years. These teachers have full state certification as defined in Sec 200.55(a) and meet the definition of highly qualified for all content areas listed on the license.

#### Teachers New to the Profession, including Transition to Teaching Candidates

All individuals receiving an initial standard license are required to pass rigorous state testing as described in Sec 200.56(b)(2) after completion of the undergraduate or graduate degree in the academic area in which the individual is prepared to teach. It is anticipated that the first licenses under the performance-based preparation rules will be issued in July 2003. This licensing system is aligned with the Indiana academic standards, so that these individuals also meet the definition of highly qualified as described in Sec 200.55(c)(2)(C). Teachers new to the profession holding a standard license meet the definition of highly qualified for content areas appearing on the license.

#### Teachers holding a Limited License

As a minimum, any teacher who has credentials waived on a temporary basis in Indiana MUST hold an undergraduate degree and have at least 15 undergraduate or graduate hours in the content area for which the limited license is issued. Limited licenses are issued for individuals holding a teaching license who are teaching out of field or individuals with an undergraduate degree, but not in education. These individuals must demonstrate satisfactory progress toward full certification (Sec 200.56(a)(ii)(4)) by completing at least 6 credit hours of coursework annually. The license advisor at the teacher preparation institution where the candidate is enrolled must document satisfactory progress. Under the new licensing rules, the limited license can be renewed annually for a period not to exceed three years, if the candidate provides documentation of satisfactory progress toward full certification. Individuals with a limited license meet the definition of highly qualified teacher.

**Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2:** The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA.

<b>Baseline Data and Targets</b>	<b>Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development</b>
2002-2003 Baseline	<b>99</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>100</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>100</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>100</b>

Every Indiana public school must adopt a school improvement plan. An integral part of the school improvement plan is a professional development program. State grant funds provide support for the professional development program. As a result, every Indiana public school teacher has access to high-quality professional development. Survey data indicate one percent of teachers either are absent or refuse to participate.

**Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3**: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

<b>Baseline Data and Targets</b>	<b>Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals</b>
2002-2003 Baseline	<b>43</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>60</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>80</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>100</b>

**Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1:** The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State.

<b>Baseline Data and Targets</b>	<b>Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

**Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1:** The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate.

**Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE**

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	<b>91</b>
African American/Black	<b>88</b>
American Indian/Native Alaskan	<b>89</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>96</b>
Hispanic	<b>85</b>
White	<b>92</b>
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	<b>90</b>
Female	<b>92</b>

Indiana's student level data system did not collect disaggregated data on all student groups in the 2001-2002 school year. Disaggregated data for all groups will be available in future years.

**PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE**

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	91	91	92.5	92.5	92.5	94	94	94	95.5	97	98.5	100
African American/Black	88	88	90	90	90	92	92	92	94	96	98	100
American Indian/Native Alaskan	89	89	91	91	91	93	93	93	95	97	99	100
Asian/Pacific Islander	96	96	96.7	96.7	96.7	97.4	97.4	97.4	98.1	98.8	99.5	100
Hispanic	85	85	87.5	87.5	87.5	90	90	90	92.5	95	97.5	100
White	92	92	93.3	93.3	93.3	94.6	94.6	94.6	95.9	97.2	98.5	100
Other												
Students with Disabilities												95
Students without Disabilities												100
Limited English Proficient												100
Economically Disadvantaged												100
Non-Economically Disadvantaged												100
Migrant												100
Male	90	90	91.7	91.7	91.7	93.4	93.4	93.4	95.1	96.8	98.5	100
Female	92	92	93.3	93.3	93.3	94.6	94.6	94.6	95.9	97.2	98.5	100

Indiana's student level data system did not collect disaggregated data for all student groups in the 2001-2002 school year. Disaggregated data for all groups will be available in future years, and intermediate targets will be set.

**Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2:** The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

#### **BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE**

<b>Student Dropouts</b>	<b>Student Dropout Rate</b>
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	<b>2.3</b>
African American/Black	<b>3.2</b>
American Indian/Native Alaskan	<b>2.8</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>1.1</b>
Hispanic	<b>4</b>
White	<b>2.1</b>
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	<b>1.9</b>
Female	<b>2.6</b>

Indiana's student level data system did not collect disaggregated data for all student groups in the 2001-2002 school year. Disaggregated data for all groups will be available in future years.

**PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE**

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	2.3	2.3	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.1	.7	.3	0
African American/Black	3.2	3.2	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.14	2.14	2.14	1.61	1.08	.55	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2.8	2.8	2.33	2.33	2.33	1.86	1.86	1.86	1.39	.92	.45	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.1	1.1	.92	.92	.92	.74	.74	.74	.56	.38	.2	0
Hispanic	4	4	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.6	2.6	2.6	.19	.12	.5	0
White	2.1	2.1	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.05	.7	.35	0
Other												0
Students with Disabilities												0
Students without Disabilities												0
Limited English Proficient												0
Economically Disadvantaged												0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged												0
Migrant												0
Male	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.3	1.3	1	.7	.4	0
Female	2.6	2.6	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.4	1	.6	0

Indiana's student level data system did not collect disaggregated data for all student groups in the 2001-2002 school year. Disaggregated data for all groups will be available in future years, and intermediate targets will be set.